UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/500,449	02/09/2000	Katsuyuki Taima	325772015100	2633

25227 7590 04/04/2006

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD
SUITE 300
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER
VU, THANH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/500,449	TAIMA, KATSUYUKI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thanh T. Vu	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 January 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *15-19, and 26-36* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *15-19, and 26-36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is responsive to Amendment, filed 01/10/06.

Claims 15-19, and 26-36 are pending in this application. This action is made Final

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 15-19, 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullaney (U.S. Pat. No. 5,917,484) and Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

Per claim 15, Mullaney teaches a device comprising:

a display unit, and means for displaying a first screen on the display unit, the first screen displaying a plurality of selectable language options for selecting a display language (fig. 4; options: 404-414; col. 4, lines 40-45) and means for displaying a second screen with an option on the display unit, wherein the first screen is displayed when the option is designated on the second screen (fig. 5; option: "<Back"), but does not teach the option having a same appearance regardless of the display language currently displayed.

However, AAPA teaches an option having a same appearance regardless of the display language currently displayed (Pg. 3, lines 5-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the option for selecting a language as taught by AAPA in the invention of Mullaney because it provides users an easier to recognize

language selection option to display the language selection screen by having the option with a same appearance regardless of the display language currently displayed.

Per claim 16, AAPA teaches a device according to claim 15, wherein the option is indicated in a predetermined language regardless of the display language currently selected (pg. 3, lines 5-11).

Per claim 17, AAPA teaches a device according to claim 16, wherein the predetermined language is English (pg. 3, lines 5-11).

Per claim 18, Mullaney teaches a device according to claim 15, wherein the option is indicated by a predetermined symbol regardless of the display language currently selected (fig. 5; symbol "<").

Per claim 19, Mullaney teaches a device according to claim 15, wherein the second screen provides plural options for various device settings (fig. 6; options: 604, 608, and 610).

Per claim 27, Mullaney teaches a display device comprising:

a display unit which displays a first screen with a plurality of selectable language options for selecting a display language (fig. 4; options: 404-414; col. 4, lines 40-45) and a second screen with an option ,wherein the first screen is displayed when the option is designated (fig. 5; option : "<Back"), but does not teach a control unit which controls the option to appear the same regardless of the display language currently displayed.

However, AAPA teaches a control unit which controls an option to appear the same regardless of the display language currently displayed (Pg. 3, lines 5-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the option for selecting a language as taught by AAPA in the invention of Mullaney because it

provides users an easier to recognize language selection option to display the language selection screen by having the option with a same appearance regardless of the display language currently displayed.

Claims 28 and 29 are rejected under the same rationale of claims 16 and 18 respectively.

Per claim 30, Mullaney teaches a method of display comprising:

displaying a first screen with an option in a first display language (fig. 5; option: "<Back");

displaying a second screen when the option is designated on the first screen, the second screen displaying a plurality of selectable language options for selecting a display language, and setting the selected language through the second screen as a second display language, the second display language being different from the first display language (fig. 4; col. 4, lines 40-45; col. 7, lines 27-29), but does not teach displaying a third screen with the option in the second display language, said option having a same appearance as in the first screen although the third screen is displayed in the second language

However, APPA teaches displaying a third screen with the option in the second display language, said option having a same appearance as in the first screen although the third screen is displayed in the second language (Pg. 3, lines 5-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the option for selecting a language as taught by AAPA in the invention of Mullaney because it provides users an easier to recognize language selection option to display the language selection screen by having the option with a same appearance regardless of the display language currently displayed.

Claims 31 and 32 are rejected under the same rationale of claims 16 and 18 respectively.

Claims 33-36 are rejected under the same rationale of claims 15, 18, 16, and 17 respectively.

Claim 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullaney (U.S. Pat. No. 5,917,484) and Kusmierczyk (U.S. Pat. No. 5,828,992).

Per claim 26, Mullaney teaches a device comprising: a display unit and a controller which displays a screen on the display unit, the screen displaying a plurality of selectable language options for selecting a display language (fig. 4; options: 404-414; col. 4, lines 40-45), But does not teach a dedicated key switch provided outside of the display unit, wherein the display language selection screen is directly displayed on the display unit when the dedicated key switch is operated, the dedicated key switch being used only for displaying the display language selecting screen on the display unit.

However, Kusmierczyk teaches a dedicated key switch provided outside of the display unit, wherein the display language selection screen is directly displayed on the display unit when the dedicated key switch is operated, the dedicated key switch being used only for displaying the display language selecting screen on the display unit (Figs 2A and 2B; col. 2, lines 58-67; function key F3 on keyboard of Fig. 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the function key option of Kusmierczyk in the invention of Mullaney because it provides users an easy access to language selection screen by means of utilizing the function keys on a keyboard.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments in the Amendment have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

Applicant's primary argument is that AAPA does not teach "displaying a second screen with an option on the display unit, the option having the same appearance regardless of the display language currently displayed, wherein the first screen is displayed when the option is designated on the second screen". The examiner does not agree for the following reasons:

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In this case, Mullaney teaches means for displaying a second screen with an option on the display unit, wherein the first screen is displayed when the option is designated on the second screen (fig. 5; option: "<Back"), but does not teach the option having a same appearance regardless of the display language currently displayed. However, AAPA teaches an option having a same appearance regardless of the display language currently displayed (Pg. 3, lines 5-11).

In addition, applicant also points out that "Kusmiercyzk merely uses that F3 key to toggle between two language, but does not display a language selecting screen". The examiner does not agree for the following reasons:

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on

combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In this case, Mullaney teaches an option wherein the display language selection screen is directly displayed on the display unit when the option is operated, the option being used only for displaying the display language selecting screen on the display (fig. 5; option: "<Back"), but does not teach the option is a dedicated key switch provided outside of the display unit. However, Kusmiercyzk teaches the option is a dedicated key switch provided outside of the display unit (Figs 2A and 2B; col. 2, lines 58-67; function key F3 on keyboard of Fig. 1).

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh T. Vu whose telephone number is (571) 272-4073. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur and every other Fri 7:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

T. Vu

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100